Concerning a New Genus, Dinocryptops, and the Nomenclatorial Status of Otocryptops and Scolopocryptops (Chilopoda: Scolopendromorpha: Cryptopidae)

By Ralph E. Crabill, Jr., Department of Entomology, Cornell University, and Ithaca College

In 1844 Newport proposed a new genus, *Scolopocryptops*,¹ to which he referred five species: *miersii* sp.n.; *melanostoma* sp.n.; ferruginea (Linne); *sc.rspinosa* (Say); and *longitarsis* sp.n. He designated no type. In 1895 Pocock ² stated that the type of this genus was *miersii* Newport, and subsequent authors have accepted his decision.

When Erich Haase proposed *Otocryptops* in 1887,³ he included a single species, *rubiginosa* (L. Koch), 1878, within it which, of course, established its type by monotypy.

But all authors have overlooked the fact the Hippolyte Lucas had already fixed the type of *Scolopocryptops* in 1849 ⁴ when he stated that its type was *Scolopocryptops melanostoma* Newport, 1844. Therefore, since *rubiginosa*, the type of *Otocryptops*, is congeneric with *melanostoma*, which is the type of *Scolopocryptops*, *Otocryptops* is a subjective synonym of *Scolopocryptops*. There is no available generic name for the species previously referred to *Scolopocryptops*; therefore, I propose the new genus *Dinocryptops*, for their reception.

In summary, those species previously referred to Otocryptops, i.e., sexspinosus (Say), melanostomus (Newport), rubiginosus (L. Koch), etc., must be accorded the generic name Scolopocryptops, whereas miersii (Newport), broelemanni (Kraepelin), etc. are referred to a new genus, Dinocryptops, the type of which is Scolopocryptops miersii Newport, 1844 [= Dinocryptops miersii (Newport)].

¹ Trans. Linn. Soc. London, XIX, p. 275 (1844).

² Biol. Centr. Amer., Chilop. Diplop., p. 28 (1895).

³ Abhand. Mus. Dresden, V, p. 96 (1887).

⁴ Dict. Univ. D'Hist. Nat., XI, p. 444 (1849).